

1 JARED BOBROW (STATE BAR NO. 133712)  
2 [jbobrow@orrick.com](mailto:jbobrow@orrick.com)  
3 JASON LANG (STATE BAR NO. 255642)  
4 [jlang@orrick.com](mailto:jlang@orrick.com)  
5 DIANA M. RUTOWSKI (STATE BAR NO. 233878)  
6 [drutowski@orrick.com](mailto:drutowski@orrick.com)  
7 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
8 1000 Marsh Road  
Menlo Park, CA 94025-1015  
Telephone: +1 650 614 7400  
Facsimile: +1 650 614 7401

7 *Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaim Plaintiff*  
8 *Micron Technology, Inc., and Defendant Micron*  
*Consumer Products Group LLC*

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 YANGTZE MEMORY TECHNOLOGIES  
13 COMPANY, LTD.,

Case No. 3:23-cv-05792-RFL

14 Plaintiff,

**MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC. AND  
MICRON CONSUMER PRODUCTS  
GROUP, LLC'S MOTION TO  
SHORTEN TIME FOR HEARING ON  
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER  
(DKT. 55) PURSUANT TO CIVIL  
LOCAL RULE 6-3**

15 v.

16 MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC., et al.,

17 Defendants.

18  
19 MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC.,

20 Counterclaim Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 YANGTZE MEMORY TECHNOLOGIES  
23 COMPANY, LTD., and YANGTZE  
MEMORY TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

24 Counterclaim Defendants.

25

26

27

28

1 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-3 of the United States  
 2 District Court for the Northern District of California and the Standing Order for Civil Cases  
 3 Before Judge Rita F. Lin (“Standing Order”), Defendant and Counterclaim Plaintiff Micron  
 4 Technology, Inc. (“MTI”), and Defendant Micron Consumer Products Group, LLC (“MCPG”)  
 5 (collectively, “Micron”) hereby request that the Court shorten the time for the hearing on  
 6 Micron’s Motion for Protective Order (Dkt. 55), which is currently scheduled for June 25, 2025,  
 7 at 10:00 a.m., to the Court’s earliest available hearing date.

8 Good cause exists to accelerate the hearing as detailed below and the Declaration of Diana  
 9 Rutowski (“Rutowski Decl.”) filed herewith. The parties conferred about this motion in an effort  
 10 to obtain a stipulation to the proposed time change, and Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendants  
 11 Yangtze Memory Technologies Company, Ltd. (“YMTCL”) and Yangtze Memory Technologies,  
 12 Inc. (“YMTI”) (collectively with YMTCL, “YMTC”) did not respond regarding whether or not  
 13 they oppose this motion. Rutowski Decl. ¶ 2.

14 **ARGUMENT**

15 As discussed during the Case Management Conference on February 21, 2024, YMTCL<sup>1</sup> is  
 16 on the Entity List of the United States Department of Commerce (“DOC”). The Entity List is part  
 17 of the Export Administration Regulations (“EAR”), which prohibit the “export, reexport, and in-  
 18 country transfer” of “any item subject to the EAR” to an entity on the Entity List, 15 C.F.R.  
 19 744.11(a), and to those “acting as an agent, front, or shell company” for the listed entity, 15  
 20 C.F.R. 744.11(c)(2). The Bureau of Industry and Security (“BIS”) advises that “extra due  
 21 diligence” is encouraged when transferring items to parties affiliated with Entity Listed entities,  
 22 including agents of such entities. *See* BIS, Entity List FAQs<sup>2</sup>; 15 C.F.R. § 744.11(c)(2) (referring  
 23 to prohibitions and license requirements when there is an “unacceptable risk that the party is  
 24 acting as an agent” for an Entity Listed entity).

25 During the parties’ negotiations over a Protective Order governing the disclosure of

---

26 <sup>1</sup> Counterclaim Defendant YMTI is YMTCL’s wholly-owned subsidiary.

27 <sup>2</sup> See [https://www.bis.doc.gov/index.php/policy-guidance/faqs#faq\\_134](https://www.bis.doc.gov/index.php/policy-guidance/faqs#faq_134) (“Do the license  
 28 requirements and policies of the Entity List apply to separately incorporated subsidiaries, partially  
 owned subsidiaries, or sister companies of a listed entity?”).

1 confidential information, Micron requested provisions in the Protective Order that would protect  
 2 against the export of its technology to YMTC and its agents. The parties conferred about  
 3 proposed revisions to this District's Model Protective Order, and while they reached agreement  
 4 on some revisions, a dispute remained as to others. The parties crystalized those areas of  
 5 agreement and disagreement in an email from YMTC's counsel on May 6, 2024, and Micron filed  
 6 a Motion for Protective Order on May 7, 2024. Dkt. 55. Micron noticed the hearing on its  
 7 Motion for Protective Order for the earliest available date of June 25, 2025, based on this Court's  
 8 rules and calendar. Dkt. 55.

9 YMTC is a listed entity, not Micron. Thus, while safeguards in the protective order are  
 10 needed for Micron to produce information to YMTC and its agent (Ropes), there is no such  
 11 restriction on YMTC—the party that initiated this litigation in this Court—producing information  
 12 to Micron in this case. Nevertheless, YMTC is now taking the position that it is not going to  
 13 comply with its upcoming obligations under Patent Local Rules 3-3 and 3-4 unless and until  
 14 Micron produces technical information about its products pursuant to Patent Local Rule 3-2.  
 15 Rutowski Decl. ¶ 2-3, Ex. A. But Micron has been clear all along that it cannot do so until  
 16 appropriate safeguards are in place as detailed in its Motion for Protective Order to ensure that it  
 17 will not be in violation of the EAR by transferring technical information to YMTC's agent,  
 18 Ropes. Dkt. 55. Thus, unless and until such an order is entered, the parties face the potential for  
 19 substantial harm and prejudice because Micron's production of technical information cannot  
 20 proceed, and YMTC has stated that it does not intend to comply with the Patent Local Rule 3-3  
 21 and 3-4 deadlines until that production occurs. As a result, Micron respectfully requests that this  
 22 Court accelerate the hearing on Micron's Motion for Protective Order to its earliest available  
 23 hearing date.

24 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-3 and Local rule 37(1)(a), the parties conferred about these  
 25 issues by telephone and email on May 9, 2024, and Micron asked for YMTC's position on the  
 26 relief sought herein by noon on May 10, 2024. Rutowski Decl. ¶ 2, Ex. A. YMTC's counsel did  
 27 not respond. *Id.* Micron submits that the requested change of the hearing date will not have any  
 28 other effect on the schedule for the case; in fact, this request is intended to keep the Patent Local

1 Rule disclosures on schedule because without a protective order in place such that Micron can  
2 produce technical documents, YMTC stated that it will seek to stay its Patent Local Rule 3-3 and  
3 3-4 disclosures.

4 Regarding previous time modifications, on November 29, 2023, the parties stipulated to  
5 extend Micron's deadline to answer or otherwise respond to the complaint from December 5,  
6 2023, to and including January 19, 2024 (Dkt. 18). On March 27, 2024, the parties filed a  
7 stipulated request to change the hearing date on YMTC's Motion to Dismiss Micron's  
8 counterclaims by one week to April 30, 2024 (Dkt. 51), which the Court granted on March 27,  
9 2024 (Dkt. 52). There have been no other time modifications in this case.

10 For all the foregoing reasons, Micron respectfully requests that there is good cause for this  
11 Court to accelerate the hearing on its Motion for Protective Order (Dkt. 55) and respectfully  
12 requests that the Court reschedule the hearing for the Court's earliest available date.

13

14 Dated: May 10, 2024

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

15

16

17 By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/ *Jared Bobrow*  
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 Jared Bobrow  
*Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaim Plaintiff*  
*Micron Technology, Inc., and Defendant Micron*  
*Consumer Products Group LLC*

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28